



302 North 1st Avenue, Suite 300 ▲ Phoenix, Arizona 85003  
Phone (602) 254-6300 ▲ FAX (602) 254-6490  
E-mail: mag@mag.maricopa.gov ▲ Web site: www.mag.maricopa.gov

November 9, 2007

TO: Members of the MAG Air Quality Technical Advisory Committee

FROM: John Kross, Queen Creek, Chair

SUBJECT: MEETING NOTIFICATION AND TRANSMITTAL OF TENTATIVE AGENDA

Monday, November 19, 2007 - 1:30 p.m.  
MAG Office, Suite 200 - Saguaro Room  
302 North 1<sup>st</sup> Avenue, Phoenix

Please park in the garage underneath the building. Bring your ticket to the meeting; parking will be validated. For those using transit, the Regional Public Transportation Authority will provide transit tickets for your trip. For those using bicycles, please lock your bicycle in the bike rack in the garage.

Pursuant to Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), MAG does not discriminate on the basis of disability in admissions to or participation in its public meetings. Persons with a disability may request a reasonable accommodation, such as a sign language interpreter, by contacting Jason Stephens at the MAG office. Requests should be made as early as possible to allow time to arrange the accommodation.

Members of the MAG Air Quality Technical Advisory Committee may attend in person, via video conference or by telephone conference call. Those attending by video conference must notify the MAG site three business days prior to the meeting.

Please be advised that under procedures approved by the MAG Regional Council, all MAG committees need to have a quorum to conduct the meeting. A quorum is a simple majority of the membership. If you are unable to attend the meeting, please make arrangements for a proxy from your entity to represent you.

A Voluntary Association of Local Governments in Maricopa County

City of Apache Junction ▲ City of Avondale ▲ Town of Buckeye ▲ Town of Carefree ▲ Town of Cave Creek ▲ City of Chandler ▲ City of El Mirage ▲ Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation ▲ Town of Fountain Hills ▲ Town of Gila Bend  
Gila River Indian Community ▲ Town of Gilbert ▲ City of Glendale ▲ City of Goodyear ▲ Town of Guadalupe ▲ City of Litchfield Park ▲ Maricopa County ▲ City of Mesa ▲ Town of Paradise Valley ▲ City of Peoria ▲ City of Phoenix  
Town of Queen Creek ▲ Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community ▲ City of Scottsdale ▲ City of Surprise ▲ City of Tempe ▲ City of Tolleson ▲ Town of Wickenburg ▲ Town of Youngtown ▲ Arizona Department of Transportation

## TENTATIVE AGENDA

### COMMITTEE ACTION REQUESTED

1. Call to Order

2. Call to the Audience

An opportunity will be provided to members of the public to address the Air Quality Technical Advisory Committee on items not scheduled on the agenda that fall under the jurisdiction of MAG, or on items on the agenda for discussion but not for action. Members of the public will be requested not to exceed a three minute time period for their comments. A total of 15 minutes will be provided for the Call to the Audience agenda item, unless the Air Quality Technical Advisory Committee requests an exception to this limit. Please note that those wishing to comment on action agenda items will be given an opportunity at the time the item is heard.

3. Approval of the September 25, 2007 Meeting Minutes

4. Update on the PM-10 Modeling for the Draft MAG 2007 Five Percent Plan for PM-10

In accordance with the Clean Air Act, the MAG Five Percent Plan for PM-10 is required to reduce PM-10 emissions by at least five percent per year until the standard is attained at the monitors. The plan is due to the Environmental Protection Agency by December 31, 2007.

In addition to the five percent reductions in emissions demonstration, the plan is also required to include a modeling attainment demonstration. The modeling attainment demonstration was performed for a 29 square mile area in the Salt River Basin and a 16 square kilometer area surrounding the Higley PM-10 monitor. A simplified rollback model was also applied to demonstrate attainment in

2. For information.

3. Review and approve the September 25, 2007 meeting minutes.

4. For information and discussion.

the nonattainment area at other monitors that exceeded the PM-10 standard in 2004-2006.

Based upon the modeling, the committed control measures in the plan reduce emissions throughout the nonattainment area and achieve attainment as expeditiously as practicable. A presentation will be given.

5. Status Report on the Draft MAG 2007 Five Percent Plan for PM-10

The MAG 2007 Five Percent Plan for PM-10 is due to the Environmental Protection Agency by December 31, 2007. Due to delays in MAG receiving material to complete the plan, the schedule has been adjusted. A public hearing is now scheduled to be conducted on the draft plan on December 12, 2007. The comments received on the plan will be discussed with the Committee. It is anticipated that the MAG Air Quality Technical Advisory Committee may make a recommendation on the plan at the December 17, 2007 meeting. The MAG Regional Council may take action to adopt the plan on December 19, 2007.

For your convenience, a copy of the public hearing notice is provided. Please refer to the enclosed material.

6. Call for Future Agenda Items

The next meeting of the Committee has been tentatively rescheduled from December 6, 2007 to **Monday, December 17, 2007 at 1:30 p.m.** The Chairman will invite the Committee members to suggest future agenda items.

5. For information and discussion.

6. For information and discussion.

MINUTES OF THE  
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS  
AIR QUALITY TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

Tuesday, September 25, 2007  
MAG Office  
Phoenix, Arizona

MEMBERS PRESENT

John Kross, Town of Queen Creek, Chairman  
#Jess Segovia, Avondale  
\*Lucky Roberts, Buckeye  
John Sherrill for Jim Weiss, Chandler  
Jamie McCullough, El Mirage  
Stephanie Prybyl for Tami Ryall, Gilbert  
Doug Kukino, Glendale  
Scott Bouchie, Mesa  
Joe Gibbs for Gaye Knight, Phoenix  
#Larry Person, Scottsdale  
Antonio DeLaCruz, Surprise  
Oddvar Tveit, Tempe  
\*Jesse Mendez, Youngtown  
\*Walter Bouchard, Citizen Representative  
#Corey Woods, American Lung Association of  
Arizona  
#Wendy Crites for Barbara Sprungl, Salt River  
Project  
Brian O'Donnell, Southwest Gas Corporation  
Mark Hajduk, Arizona Public Service Company  
\*Gina Grey, Western States Petroleum Association  
\*Randi Alcott, Valley Metro  
Dave Berry, Arizona Motor Transport Association  
Jeannette Fish, Maricopa County Farm Bureau  
\*Russell Bowers, Arizona Rock Products  
Association

\*Michelle Rill, Greater Phoenix Chamber of  
Commerce  
\*Amanda McGennis, Associated General  
Contractors  
Spencer Kamps for Connie Wilhelm-Garcia,  
Homebuilders Association of Central  
Arizona  
Mannie Carpenter, Valley Forward  
\*Kai Umeda, University of Arizona Cooperative  
Extension  
Beverly Chenausky, Arizona Department of  
Transportation  
Diane Arnst for Peter Hyde, Arizona  
Department of Environmental Quality  
Wienke Tax, Environmental Protection Agency  
Jo Crumbaker, Maricopa County Air Quality  
Department  
Duane Yantorno, Arizona Department of  
Weights and Measures  
\*Ed Stillings, Federal Highway Administration  
\*Judi Nelson, Arizona State University  
\*B. Bobby Ramirez, Salt River Pima-Maricopa  
Indian Community  
\*David Rueckert, Citizen Representative

\*Members neither present nor represented by proxy.  
#Participated via telephone conference call.  
+Participated via video conference call.

OTHERS PRESENT

Lindy Bauer, Maricopa Association of Governments  
Dean Giles, Maricopa Association of Governments  
Julie Hoffman, Maricopa Association of  
Governments  
Patrisia Navarro, Maricopa Association of  
Governments  
Ieesuck Jung, Maricopa Association of  
Governments  
Taejoo Shin, Maricopa Association of Governments  
Cathy Arthur, Maricopa Association of  
Governments  
Ranjith Dandanayakula, Maricopa Association of  
Governments

Shane Kiesow, City of Apache Junction  
Heather Hodgman, City of Apache Junction  
Corinne Purtill, The Arizona Republic  
Jane McVay, Arizona Department of  
Transportation  
Cathy Chaberski, City of Glendale  
Scott Dibiasse, Pinal County  
Collen McKaughn, Environmental Protection  
Agency  
Steve Peplau, Arizona Department of  
Environmental Quality  
Mario Saldamando, City of Goodyear  
Eileen Yazzie, Maricopa Association of  
Governments

1. Call to Order

A meeting of the MAG Air Quality Technical Advisory Committee was conducted on September 25, 2007. John Kross, Town of Queen Creek, Chair, called the meeting to order at approximately 1:32 p.m. Jess Segovia, City of Avondale; Larry Person, City of Scottsdale; Wendy Crites, Salt River Project; and Cory Woods, American Lung Association, attended the meeting via telephone conference call. Mr. Kross, Town Manager, Town of Queen Creek, introduced himself as the new Chair of the MAG Air Quality Technical Advisory Committee.

2. Call to the Audience

Mr. Kross stated that, according to the MAG public comment process, members of the audience who wish to speak are requested to fill out comment cards, which are available on the tables adjacent to the doorways inside the meeting room. Citizens are asked not to exceed a three minute time period for their comments. Public comment is provided at the beginning of the meeting for nonagenda items and nonaction agenda items. He noted that no public comment cards had been received.

3. Approval of the June 28, 2007 Meeting Minutes

The Committee reviewed the minutes from the June 28, 2007 meeting. Beverly Chenausky, Arizona Department of Transportation, moved and Joe Gibbs, City of Phoenix, seconded and the motion to approve the June 28, 2007 meeting minutes carried unanimously.

4. Evaluation of Proposed CMAQ Projects for the FY 2009-2013 MAG TIP

Dean Giles, Maricopa Association of Governments (MAG), stated that MAG has conducted and evaluation of the estimated emission reductions for the proposed Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement (CMAQ) projects submitted for FY 2013 for the update of the fiscal year 2009 through 2013 MAG Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). He mentioned that MAG had a very tight schedule in conducting the project evaluations. He stated that the deadline for the submission of projects was September 7, 2007. He added that Intelligent Transportation Systems Projects for FY 2009 had the deadline extended to September 14, 2007 to give member agencies more time to submit the projects. Mr. Giles indicated that the role of the Committee is to forward the evaluation of the proposed CMAQ projects for the FY 2009-2013 MAG TIP to the MAG Transportation Review Committee (TRC) and modal committees for use in prioritizing projects. He added that the Air Quality Technical Advisory Committee may rank the air quality projects in attachment one table one to be forward to the TRC. A clear copy of attachment two and the tentative schedule for the CMAQ projects were provided to the Committee.

Mr. Giles stated that the next scheduled meeting with regard to the CMAQ projects will be Thursday, September 27, 2007 at the TRC. He mentioned that the estimated emission reduction benefits for the proposed CMAQ projects were provided to the Committee in attachment one, tables one through five. He indicated that MAG used the CMAQ methodologies that were the subject of a workshop and commented on by members of the Committee. He stated that the funding for 2013 includes approximately \$6.9 million for ITS projects, \$8.7 million for bicycle and pedestrian projects, and approximately \$7.5 million for air quality projects based on the Regional Transportation Plan allocations. He added that approximately \$1.5 million was made available for fiscal year 2009 for ITS projects. He mentioned that the cost effectiveness is in CMAQ dollars requested per metric tons of pollution reduced. He stated that in table one, the paving of unpaved road projects and street sweepers were the two PM-10 related projects. He added that this is the lump sum that is being set aside for the

future year of the TIP in 2013. He mentioned that paving of unpaved road projects for 2010 will be discussed further in the following agenda items. He stated that a lump sum funding is also being set aside for PM-10 certified street sweeper projects for year 2013. He added that funding for year 2008 street sweeper projects will be discussed in the following agenda items.

Mr. Giles stated that there are two City of Mesa projects submitted for Compressed Natural Gas (CNG) related projects in table one. He added that those projects were evaluated and found to have no overall benefit. He mentioned that in table two the Committee will see the bike and pedestrian projects, in table three the ITS projects for FY 2013, table four an intersection improvement project, and in table five ITS projects for FY 2009. He added that for the FY 2009 ITS projects, it was determined that two Maricopa County projects were not eligible.

Brian O'Donnell, Southwest Gas Corporation, inquired why there was no benefit for the City of Mesa projects. Mr. Giles replied that MAG took a look at the emission factors for light duty vehicles for 2013 and discovered that the CNG vehicles, the compressed emission factors were higher than they were with gasoline vehicles. Mr. O'Donnell inquired that if the same 2013 engines are using a cleaner hydrocarbon gasoline why is it not coming out cleaner. Cathy Arthur, MAG, stated that for MOBILE 6.2 for CNG and gas, the VOC and NOx was higher and the PM-10 was lower but when the weighting was applied the overall benefit was negative.

Diane Arnst, Arizona Department of Environmental Quality (ADEQ), stated that it appears that the bicycle and pedestrian projects allocation is higher than the air quality projects allocation. She added that ADEQ supports the bicycle and pedestrian oriented design because of the smart growth but to the understanding of ADEQ there is another pot of money that is the STP enhancement fund that focused on that. She mentioned that the region is the second of the three worst areas of the United States for PM-10 pollution. She indicated that the previous year, several Committee members requested that the Air Quality Committee suggest to the MAG Regional Council that the allocations be changed so that the focus be on air quality projects. She stated that by looking at the fact sheet she understood that all of the projects were supposed to be air quality projects and she does not understand why there is \$8.7 million for bicycle and pedestrian projects and only \$7.5 million for air quality projects. Mr. Giles replied that the allocation is contained in the Regional Transportation Plan which was the subject of referendum in Maricopa County. He added that the Regional Transportation Plan reflects the desire by the public to have a multi-modal plan and therefore in addition to air quality projects, it includes bicycle and pedestrian projects.

Spencer Kamps, Homebuilders Association of Central Arizona, inquired if the percentage breakdown between bicycle, air quality, and ITS was adopted by the voters. Mr. Giles replied that attachment four is directly out of the Regional Transportation Plan, table 5-5 contains the percentages of CMAQ by the different modes. Mr. Kamps asked if CMAQ was regional sales tax revenue or federal funds. Mr. Giles responded that it is federal funding. He commented on limitations and the voter approved half-cent sales tax for the regional transportation system. Mr. Kamps inquired about CMAQ being federal funds and not subject to what was approved by the voters. Mr. Kross stated that there is a procedural system in place with respect of various programs and referred to MAG staff to explain the procedure. Lindy Bauer, MAG, stated the voters in 2004 approved the extension of the half-cent sales tax. The expectation of the voters was that this would be a multi-modal plan. She stated that table 5-5 is out of the Regional Transportation Plan as described by Mr. Giles with the percent funding allocation indicated. She mentioned that the Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program is a federal pot of money. She added that it can be used for transportation projects that reduce

transportation related emissions. Mr. Kamps inquired about the CMAQ money tables and the regional half-cent sales tax. Ms. Bauer referred to table 5-5 and the half-cent column. Mr. Kross stated that the CMAQ allocation by mode can be seen in attachment four.

Mr. Spencer asked if the project list of the money was distributed throughout the tables. Mr. Kross inquired if Mr. Kamps was asking about 14.6 percent that is allocated for the CMAQ. Mr. Kamps asked why the air quality projects were at \$7.5 million. He noted that the ITS \$6.7 million and bicycles are at \$8.7, when the numbers in the table show that the greatest PM-10 reductions come from paving. He added that the table reads that paving unpaved roads program is only \$4.5 million. He inquired why such a nominal amount of money is being allocated to the most cost effective measure that is related to reducing PM-10 when the region is in this current situation.

Eileen Yazzie, MAG, commented on the first question that Mr. Kamps asked on how CMAQ dollars were related to the Regional Transportation Plan and the half-cent sales tax. She added that when the voters passed Proposition 400 it was the extension that the half-cent sales tax as well as understood that MAG was the Regional Planning Organization for this area and that the Transportation Plan would be in place and followed. She stated that table 5-5 shows the original funding allocation in the RTP. She added that the entirety of table 5-5 make up the regional funds. She indicated that the half-cent sales tax is displayed in the first column of table 5-5. Ms. Yazzie stated that the half-cent sales tax and CMAQ are two different funds. She stated that the left hand side of table 5-5 determines the mode that the percentage goes into. She mentioned that the percentages per type of fund were decided when the RTP was established in 2003. She stated that the 14.6 percent of CMAQ funds for air quality are not only for paving dirt roads and street sweepers. She added that the 14.6 percent also support other projects that are shown in table one.

Mr. Kamps asked if the 14.6 percent was being distributed to \$8.7 million for bikes, \$6.7 million for ITS, and \$7.5 million for air quality. Ms. Yazzie replied that the 14.6 was not being distributed between those programs. She added that the 14.6 percent represented the air quality program. She indicated that the 17 percent shown in table 5-5 in the bicycle/pedestrian mode represents the allocation for the bicycle/pedestrian programs. She mentioned that ITS is funded under the streets mode which is the 13.4 percent of CMAQ funds. Mr. Kamps inquired if the 14.6 percent of CMAQ funds equal \$7.5 million dollars. Ms. Yazzie stated that the total allocation for the air quality program represented by the 14.6 percent is \$7.5 million dollars.

Dave Berry, Arizona Motor Transport Association, referred to table 5-5 under Percent Funding by Major Mode. He asked in which major mode would the bicycle program fall. Ms. Yazzie replied that it would fall into the Other mode. Mr. Berry asked in which major mode would the ITS fall. Ms. Yazzie replied that it would fall into the Streets mode. Mr. Berry also asked in which major mode would the air quality fall. Ms. Yazzie responded that it would fall into the Other mode. Mr. Berry commented that there is a provision within the Transportation Plan that was passed by the voters, that changes can be made to the plan. He added that there is a scale of changes, and there is a process that has been exercised already with other projects for a variety of reasons. He commented on the possibility for the Committee to ask for a change if appropriate. He indicated that if the Committee would like to direct more money into higher impact air quality projects the Committee could make that recommendation with the understanding that it would require some changes in the plan which would trigger a more difficult process. Ms. Yazzie commented that the process that Mr. Berry was talking about is defined in the law that passed, as a major amendment or a minor amendment. She indicated that this would trigger a major amendment to the plan. She added that process has been exercised by

Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) when they shift some of the goals and projects around as well as with the funding. She added that it would be up to the Committee to decide what they would like to do.

Mr. Berry commented on the major amendment. He stated that within the Transportation Plan there is a structure that says that the dollars must remain within the major modes and dollars can not be shifted within the major modes. Ms. Yazzie asked if he was talking about the firewalls. Mr. Berry responded yes. She replied that the firewalls for the half-cent sales tax are written from the Proposition 400. She added that the half-cent sales tax and the percentages can not shift. She indicated that the other funds, FTA, CMAQ, MAG-STP are not within the firewalls. Mr. Berry commented on Funding by Major Mode. He added that the Committee has a better case to make in terms of the process because the bike and air quality projects are located within the Other mode. He commented that the outcome would be unknown if the Committee concluded that it would be a wise course of action to shift the funds within. He mentioned that the Committee is here to advise on air quality matters. He stated that the Committee should give the best thinking on air quality matters and see how it works its way through the process.

Scott Bouchie, City of Mesa, stated that the \$7.5 is enough to fund all of the air quality projects and asked where the money would go into if additional funds were provided. He commented that in the past, paving unpaved roads and street sweepers have been the areas that seem to be the most cost effective. He inquired whether the Committee would be able to add that money into those areas and then the municipalities could do another application for the unpaved roads. Mr. Giles replied that the process to make a major amendment to the RTP takes several months. He added that it takes close consultation with key members who helped to establish and produce the RTP. He stated that he would check if there would be sufficient time to make a change to RTP to reallocate funding for fiscal year 2013. Ms. Yazzie asked if he was talking about the current paving unpaved road projects. Mr. Bouchie stated that after adding all the projects with the exception of the two Mesa projects he came up with a total of \$7.4 million dollars. He inquired about the allocation of additional funds. Ms. Yazzie replied that the total in the project list may total to \$7.4 but the allocation, the \$7.5 is spread out over paving dirt roads, street sweepers and a variety of other projects. She indicated that the number for paving dirt roads and street sweepers is actually lower \$7.5 million dollars. She added that there are no additional funds for the Committee to request at this time. She stated that if the Committee requested a change to go forward in funding percentages it would not affect this round of projects, it would be too late for a long process.

Ms. Arnst referred to the attachment for paving unpaved roads and fiscal year 2010. She stated that \$7.1 million was requested and only \$3.5 million were allocated. She inquired if the funds could be reprogrammed so that the unpaved road projects for attainment year 2010 could be funded in place of the bicycle projects that have minimal PM-10 reduction. Mr. Giles replied that for FY 2010 the approved TIP indicates that there is only \$3.5 available and there are no additional funds. Ms. Arnst commented about reallocating \$3.5 million from the bicycle projects and FY 2013. She inquired if the Committee can use that to pave what was requested to be paved for the attainment year. Mr. Giles replied that the Committee has been discussing a possible change to the allocation percentages in the RTP. He indicated that it would take additional time to change the allocations beyond the time that is available to program projects for year 2013.

Mr. Kross commented on the RTP process. Ms. Yazzie stated that the approved TIP is in place is for fiscal years 2008-2012. She stated that the allocations that are set in the RTP are already programmed for bike, pedestrian, and ITS through 2012. She added that 2013 allocations still stand as to what the RTP has set for programming this year. She mentioned that if the Committee moves forward with a funding request change through the committees, it would not affect this current programming round but it could affect future programming rounds.

Mr. Berry commented that the deadline for attainment is 2010 and many businesses and governments have made commitments through 2013. He added that there have been changes in the last 6 months to achieve compliance. He stated that it would be reasonable for this Committee to look at putting as much money into projects that would have the most benefit for air quality in order to help achieve goals by 2010. He indicated that it is the responsibility of the Committee to be aggressive and do the most possible that it can in order to help reach attainment. Wienke Tax, Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), inquired why the Bicycle Safety Education Program has the same emission reduction as the Regional Rideshare Program. Mr. Giles replied that the regional Bicycle Program is like the other transportation demand management projects. It provides an education and outreach component for bicycle safety and is like the other regional rideshare types of projects that have a similar emission reduction.

Mr. O'Donnell inquired if revisions can be submitted to the program for 2008 through 2012. Ms. Yazzie stated that with every MAG program you could make amendments, changes, additions, and modifications. Ms. Yazzie commented that she has worked with all the modes due to the multi-modal Regional Transportation Plan. She added that the bicycle and pedestrian, ITS, Safety, and TAC committees have worked long and hard for their share of the Regional Transportation Plan and their committed funding sources. Mr. O'Donnell commented on shifting funds to help reach attainment by 2008. He stated that he did not know the process to shift funds but if funding was available the Committee should look at it. Ms. Yazzie stated that doing an inventory of what dirt roads are out there has been one of the issues that the TAC has been working on. She added that different committees have discussed this issue at length. She mentioned that it is better to understand the source of the problem before throwing money at it. She indicated that it will be considered when this issue is under evaluation.

Mr. Kamps inquired if CMAQ money is the only federal program that is designated for air quality. Mr. Giles replied that the purpose of CMAQ is to attain the standard in nonattainment areas. Mr. Kamps stated that he supports the comments made by the other Committee members. He commented that the Committee needs to look at reallocating the amounts. He mentioned that he understood the process at MAG but it is the obligation of the Committee to strongly look at reallocation. Mr. Kamps stated that his concern is that the five year planning matrix that everyone must abide by is a good thing when it comes to transportation. He commented that the Committee is under some serious pressure to come into attainment and that although the MAG process may work for transportation it does not afford the Air Quality Committee the opportunity to make quick decisions. He added that this is an issue to consider as it relates to air quality funding for projects that reduce PM-10.

Mr. Giles stated that another purpose of CMAQ in addition to air quality is it also helps mitigate congestion which the region experiences a high level of congestion. Ms. Arnst stated that there are no scores for congestion management in the CMS score column. She added that it would be helpful for the Committee to have that information for evaluation. Mannie Carpenter, Valley Forward

commented about the Committee recommending a chart with no CMS scores to the next Committee that will have the scores included in the chart. Mr. Kross stated that there are two action items requested for the agenda item, one is the evaluation of the proposed CMAQ projects and the other is the ranking of air quality projects. He indicated that there is not an opportunity at this meeting with respect to the action item to give consideration of reallocation. He mentioned that the Committee could give some additional comments to be part of the minutes or on the motion that is decided with respect of evaluation for upcoming fiscal years depending on the process. He indicated that he is not sure that there is a consensus on that issue from the Committee. He added that the Committee has not heard from the other municipalities on this issue as well.

Antonio DeLaCruz, City of Surprise, stated that he would like to see some numbers on what the real problem is. He added that Surprise is not spending a lot of money on the many dirt roads that they have because they are rarely driven. He indicated that the funding issue can be addressed when there is a report developed on the problem. Ms. Bauer stated that the comments are appreciated. She added that a few months ago at the MAG Management Committee meeting one of the managers suggested that the cities turn in to MAG the unpaved roads that are in the County islands. She stated that MAG received about 200 miles of unpaved roads from the MAG cities and towns. She mentioned that MAG started digging deeper into the unpaved roads issue. She indicated that MAG has identified through GIS about 1,680 miles of unpaved roads. She stated that this is just a rough number subject to change. She commented that many of these may turn out to be private unpaved roads. She added that there may be an issue of not being able to use public monies to pave private unpaved roads. She stated that each MAG member agency has a map with all of the unpaved roads that were found. She added that MAG is asking for help from the cities to give clarification whether these are private unpaved roads or if they are public.

Beverly Chenausky inquired why the Maricopa County projects were not eligible under the ITS on table five attachment one. She asked if there was enough money to fund the entire attachment one. Mr. Giles stated that he did not have the answer for that. Ms. Yazzie replied no. She commented on the issue brought up earlier of the \$7.5 million requested for unpaved roads when the allocation is only \$3.5 million dollars. She added that there is definitely some challenges between each committee. She indicated that the Bike/Pedestrian and ITS Committees will be meeting in the following months to continue to work with their ceiling limits and program their projects per their limits. She added that on agenda item number six, the street sweeper table has some idea of how many street sweepers we funded and the ones that were not funded. She commented that it would be difficult to rank this table without knowing how much money there is available or to put them by order. She inquired if the intent in this meeting is to rank the projects. Mr. Giles responded that the intent was to forward the evaluation.

Mr. Gibbs inquired if the available \$3.5 million dollars for paving unpaved roads was for the year 2010. He asked if the allocation is increasing from \$3.5 million to \$4.5 million because there has been no request for paving unpaved roads in 2013. Mr. Giles replied that in table one the lump sum to be set aside for the unpaved program for 2013 is \$4,513,000. Mr. Gibbs inquired if the allocation is increasing from 2010 to 2013 from \$3.5 million to \$4.5 million. He commented that the allocation for 2010 is \$3.5 million. Mr. Giles replied that the TDM projects CMAQ funding levels do not increase. MAG has been increasing the amounts of funding available for paving projects to be able to program to the maximum percentage provided by the RTP. He added that over the next several

years the Committee will see an increase from \$3.5 million in 2010 to \$3.65 million in 2011 and \$5 million in 2012. He commented that it will be increasing incrementally over the next few years.

Mr. Kamps inquired how much is being spent this fiscal year and next fiscal year on paving dirt roads and street sweepers projects. Mr. Giles replied that he did not have that information with him. Ms. Bauer stated that the Regional Council recently allocated \$5 million dollars to be used for paving of dirt road projects. She commented that the Regional Council allocated this on May 23, 2007. She added that this \$5 million dollar allocation was meant for the PM-10 Plan. Ms. Bauer indicated that the projects were approved by the MAG Regional Council in July. She stated that the additional \$5 million dollars has already been programmed to help with PM-10. Mr. Kamps inquired if those funds will be going to the 200 miles that was identified by MAG and the cities under 100 trip per day threshold. Ms. Arthur replied no and that was a separate issue. Mr. Kamps inquired if it would go to new miles. Ms. Arthur responded that it was correct. Mr. Kamps asked who determines where the \$5 million dollars go. Ms. Bauer stated that the proposed projects had gone through this Committee. She added that the projects were evaluated and ranked by the committee and the recommendation went to the MAG Management Committee and were approved by the Regional Council in July.

Mr. Berry commented that in table one of attachment one the purchased PM-10 street sweepers reduces 192 kilograms per day in emission reductions for PM-10. He added that the Bicycle Safety Education Program reduces 300 kilograms per day. Mr. Kross commented that the analyses with respect to the various programs and the extent of the pots of money is a complicated issue. Mr. Berry stated that the Bicycle Education Program exceeds everything except paving unpaved roads and it outperforms Carpool Education and Incentive of Carpool. Mr. Kross commented on the comprehensiveness of the Regional Transportation Plan and expectations on those who are providing funding from various sources. Mr. Berry motioned that the Committee cross the boundaries of how the money is divided between modes based on cost effectiveness, and that the money go to projects that are the most cost effective and have the biggest impact on reducing or improving air quality. Mr. Kross inquired if the motion was to address the proportions that are in table 5-5 or if Mr. Berry was talking about attachment one and the various tables. Mr. Berry replied that he was looking at table one. He stated that the motion should indicate that the boundaries that are established should not be respected in terms of the pots of money and the money be placed in the most effective measure for PM-10 reduction. Mr. Kamps seconded the motion. Mr. O'Donnell stated that someone has to go back and look at all of the items and see which ones can be moved. He added that one approach is to go with the most cost effective item and the other approach is to look at each item individually and see which one could be moved. Mr. Berry stated that he would agree to amend the motion. He indicated that whether the Committee decides to do another meeting or just provide guidance, the message is what is important. Ms. Chenausky mentioned amending the motion so that the Committee forwards attachment one for review and recommend that table one of attachment one be funded except for the Mesa projects. Mr. Berry did not accept the amendment.

Mr. Gibbs stated that these tables are organized by the authorities of the subcommittees that review them. He commented on the matter of the boundaries being taken away. Ms. Bauer stated that when the committee first started, all of the projects were in one big table. She added that after the Regional Transportation Plan and the extension of the half-cent sales tax came into being, the Regional Transportation Plan with allocation by mode is when the Committee started to evaluate the projects by mode. Mr. Berry mentioned that his position has been consistent. He added that the air quality situation, the Committee needs to put the resources where it is going to do the most good for air

quality. He commented that the Committee needs to push ahead with the concept and send the message. Mr. O'Donnell stated that the Committee could ask for the support of other committees to allocate more funds to the air quality projects so that more roads can be paved. He inquired about the total amount of money in attachment one. Ms. Yazzie stated that an analyses of the dollar amount per year is available. She commented on the tables in attachment one and stated that more information can be provided on the total amounts. She mentioned that each committee is tasked with different modes. She added that respect has to be given to the job that ITS and Bike/Ped committees do as well as the this committee. She stated that this agenda indicates that a recommendation is needed to forward the evaluation of FY 2009-2013 CMAQ projects. She mentioned that she thought the Committee was forwarding the CMAQ scores and not a ranking of all the other projects by mode. She added that if the Committee wishes to make that motion, it would be shared with other modes but the other committees can not act on that motion, they will continue to move the evaluation and programing of their projects forward. Ms. Chenausky stated that the agenda states ranking of the air quality projects. Ms. Yazzie responded that it was just for the air quality projects and it does not ask for a ranking of other modes. Mr. Kross stated that it was just for table one of attachment one.

Stephanie Prybyl, Town of Gilbert, asked for the clarification on the motion. Ms. Arnst stated that she understood from what Ms. Yazzie stated before that the air quality projects and bicycle and pedestrian projects are in the same major mode which is Other. She stated that she understood the motion to be, to ask MAG Regional Council to reallocate more money into air quality projects than in bicycle and pedestrian projects out of the CMAQ pot of money and to rank in order of cost effectiveness of table one items. She added that if this is correct she would support the motion on behalf of ADEQ. Mr. Berry commented that he thought the Committee was being asked to evaluate all of the tables because an emission reduction score has been given in each table. He added that emissions reduction score on the table implies a ranking within the Bike/Ped and within the ITS. Mr. Giles replied that the emissions reduction on each table is not a ranking within each mode. He indicated that the other modal committees are provided with information that they use to rank projects within their individual mode in addition to the CMAQ score that is provided to this Committee. Mr. Berry inquired what a CMAQ score was. Mr. Giles replied that the CMAQ score is the cost effectiveness provided in this list. The other committees use other information in developing the modal rankings and forward the ranked projects to the Transportation Review Committee. Mr. Berry asked if the other committees consider the emission reductions. Mr. Giles responded yes.

Ms. Prybyl asked for clarification that the Committee is not beyond the scope of what is suppose to do today and if the Committee decides to divert funds in any way it should be brought back. Mr. Kross stated that procedure would be to sent to the Management Committee. He commented that in the next meeting staff could give a full explanation of the process table 5-5. Ms. Bauer stated that MAG could have the transportation staff come back and discuss the process. She indicated that there is a MAG Transportation Policy Committee, MAG Management and MAG Regional Council. She added that this Committee is the Air Quality Technical Advisory Committee and as indicated earlier, should review all of the air quality numbers and forward them so that they could be used by other committees when they are deliberating the projects by mode. She mentioned that table one contains the air quality specific projects. She added that these projects are transportation control measures that have been included in the air quality plans and that is the reason they are called air quality projects. She indicated that those projects can be ranked by this Committee and forwarded for recommendation. Mr. Kross asked if the Committee was clear with respect to the procedure and the direction staff is asking for from the group. Mr. Kamps inquired if there was a motion. Mr. Kross responded there was

a motion and a second. Mr. Kamps inquired if there were two issues that the Committee has to deal with. Mr. Kross responded that one item is the evaluation of the projects and the other item for action is ranking air quality projects in table one.

Mr. Kamps indicated that the construction industry is often told that they need to do their part in air quality so that Federal Transportation dollars are not threatened. He mentioned that it is unusual that the Committee to be quibbling over \$3.5, \$4.5 and \$7.5 million dollars compared to the amount of federal dollars lost if the air is not cleaned up. He stated that he understands the MAG process and the Committee members trying to operate within the process. He commented on the suggestion that Mr. O'Donnell gave on additional revenue. He indicated that if the Committee does not help the air quality problems it will hurt MAG's funding. He added that MAG is the Regional Planning Agency for this issue and MAG will lose their federal dollars if the Committee does not solve the air quality problem. He commented that the amount of money invested in this issue is not enough.

Ms. Prybyl stated that she did not understand how this was going to be implemented. Mr. Kross indicated that if there is a structural change required to the reappropriation it can not go much further with respect to any implementation. Doug Kukino, City of Glendale, mentioned that there were two big issues. He added that one, is of the process that is occurring. He stated that the Committee needs more information so that these issues can be discussed. He indicated that the other issue is the recommendations on the CMAQ air quality impacts to forward to the committees. He stated that he is much comfortable with a motion and a vote on the CMAQ impacts and forward it to the committees. He added that a second motion should be made talking about the process. He mentioned that he is concerned about the actual process. Ms. Prybyl stated that there is a commitment to talk about the process for a major amendment at the Committee. She indicated that there is also a review of the dirt roads. She commented on opposition to review the process through this Committee. She added that she does not think the Committee needs to vote on that issue.

It was requested that the motion be restated. Ms. Bauer stated that the recommendation is not to respect the boundaries and to put the funding in the projects with the biggest air quality impacts and that are most cost effective. Mr. Berry stated that PM-10 would be the qualifier on the air quality impact. Mr. Kross asked if Mr. Kamps accepted the clarification on the motion. Mr. Kamps accepted. Ms. Prybyl inquired if this motion applied to all of the projects in all the tables or just table one. Mr. Berry responded that in attachment one there are several tables so this motion would apply to all of the projects on attachment one. Ms. Arnst asked if it applied to both tables one and table two which were both in the same major mode. Mr. Kross asked if the motion is for all of the projects in attachment one. Mr. Berry stated that is correct. Mr. Berry asked what table Ms. Arnst was referring to. Ms. Arnst responded table 5-5 that Mr. Berry referred to before. She added that the Committee was told that the Other mode referred to the same listed in table one, which is the air quality projects and table two which is the bicycle and pedestrian projects. She mentioned that tables 3-5 are in different modes. Mr. Berry responded that he would not cross firewalls. He added that firewalls really apply to the half cent sales tax dollars not the federal funds. He stated that he will accept that clarification to keep the dollars within the major modes described at the bottom of attachment four table 5-5. Duane Yantorno, Arizona Department of Weights and Measures, inquired if this was limited to CMAQ money. Mr. Kross stated that is correct. Larry Person, City of Scottsdale, stated that from reading attachment one, the only affected project from outside of table one would be the first project on table two, the Valley Metro Bicycle Safety Education Program which has a high ranking on air quality. He added

that all of the other projects rank much lower than the Valley Metro Bicycle Safety Education Program project. Ms. Bauer indicated that Mr. Person stated that table two, the first project, would go up into the rankings with table one, that would be the net effect. Mr. Kross called for a vote on the motion, which failed.

Mr. Kukino made a motion to recommend to forward the evaluation of the proposed CMAQ projects for the FY 2009-2013 to the MAG Transportation Review Committee and modal committees for use in prioritizing projects. Ms. Prybyl seconded the motion. Mr. Bouchie inquired if they can add in the motion that the Committee rank the Air Quality Projects by cost effectiveness. Mr. Kukino asked if it was a separate motion or should that be included in the same motion. Mr. Kross responded that it can be handled in one motion if acceptable by the maker of the motion and the person who seconded it. Mr. Kukino stated that he will amend the motion to include to the second half of the recommendation. In addition, rank the Air Quality Projects to be forwarded to the MAG Transportation Review Committee. Ms. Prybyl agreed to the amendment of the motion.

Mr. Yantorno commented that the Committee could not rank this program because according to MAG staff the City of Mesa projects had emission increases and it is not reflected in the table. Ms. Bauer replied that it is due to the weighting. Ms. Arthur replied that NB stands for no benefit. She added that it has been a traditional treatment to put NB any time there is a negative effect. Mr. Yantorno inquired if there was some PM-10 benefits, and if it was weighted by the fact that there were increases in VOC and NOx. Ms. Arthur replied that there was a small PM-10 benefit. She stated that typically all of the projects are set up in a weighted mode, so it would had to been treated different within any other project. She added that the same ratings for VOC, NOx, and PM-10 are used for every project in the tables.

Mr. Berry inquired if the motion was to include and fund the two City of Mesa projects. Mr. Kukino replied that the motion is to forward the evaluation. He asked MAG to clarify on the two Mesa projects. Ms. Bauer stated that there was not enough funding for all of the projects in table one. Mr. Berry inquired if the projects dropped off the list for anything that was no benefit. Ms. Bauer mentioned that for table one for example, the committee needs to look and see if they are comfortable with the air quality and cost effectiveness numbers for ranking of the projects. She stated that there is not sufficient funding for all the projects on the list. Mr. Berry inquired if the cost effectiveness would be the score third from the far right column in table one. Ms. Bauer replied yes. She added that they are ranked in order of cost effectiveness with the best cost effectiveness on the top of table one. Mr. Berry asked if the cost effectiveness is weighted or if it is just taking the total tons and dividing it by a total cost. Mr. Giles responded that it is weighted by total metric tons by CMAQ dollars requested.

Mr. Berry inquired if some of the emissions are less of a problem than others. Mr. Kross responded that as Ms. Bauer stated, the Committee can send the table forward if it is acceptable to make it a motion. He added that based on funding as it works the way through the next steps of the process the bottom projects of table one may fall off. Mr. Berry inquired if one of the projects that the Committee thought was worthy gets dropped off would the two remaining projects be next in line or would there be a fresh look at all. He inquired what the process would be if more funds became available or projects get dropped off the list. Mr. Giles replied that he does not foresee any projects dropping off the list. He added that if it is the Committee's desire, the list can be forwarded without the Mesa projects. Mr. Berry stated that the concern is that 2013 is a few years away. He added that if money becomes available or a project gets dropped off from the list, the Committee would want to reevaluate

what would be the most effective way to spend money and not create a queue that says a project with no benefit would rise to the top as a project with benefit.

Mr. Kukino stated that the issue is whether to include the two Mesa projects in the recommendation. He added that after hearing comments he would like to hear more on the subject. Mr. Kross stated that the Committee understood the motion and it has been seconded. Mr. Kukino commented that his motion included the two Mesa projects. Mr. Kross mentioned that the issue was being discussed and inquired if Mr. Kukino would like to amend the motion and discuss the amendment. Mr. Yantorno stated that the entire list should be submitted and handle the rankings separately. Mr. Kukino amended the motion to be the first part of the motion and vote on the second part later. Mr. Kross inquired if Ms. Prybyl accepted the amendment to recommend the evaluation of the projects. Ms. Prybyl accepted. Mr. Kross called for a vote on the motion to forward the evaluation of proposed CMAQ projects to the modal committees and MAG Transportation Review Committee for prioritizing projects. The motion passed with 2 members voting no.

Mr. Person motioned to rank the projects listed in table one by emissions reduction weighted for PM-10 instead of the way they are ranked currently and that there be no comment or no ranking notation next to the two Mesa projects. Mr. Berry seconded the motion. Ms. Arthur commented that if the Committee wishes to take that approach the benefit of the two Mesa projects could be quantified so that it would have a benefit for PM-10. She added that the weighting on PM-10 is 1; the weighting on VOC is .37; and the weighting for NOx is .44. She stated that a positive value can be put on the table for the two projects if weighted on PM-10. Mr. Person inquired if the original presentation made by Mr. Giles indicated that the two Mesa projects no longer qualified. Mr. Kross responded that the comment was for Maricopa County. Mr. Giles responded that was correct. Mr. Person asked what was the comment on the two Mesa projects. Mr. Giles replied that the comment related to the air quality benefit for the two Mesa projects. Mr. Kross inquired if the modification was acceptable to the Mesa projects to show a slight benefit on the PM-10 ranking based on the motion. Mr. Person accepted. Mr. Kross inquired if Mr. Berry accepted the modification on the motion. Mr. Berry accepted.

Mr. Carpenter stated that the Committee should not become myopic on the fact that there is a PM-10 problem as there could be a potential ozone problem which is NOx and organic related. He commented on the PM-10 problem being under control if the Five Percent Plan works. He added that it would not be a wise idea for the Committee to just focus on PM-10. Mr. Gibbs inquired if the cost effectiveness was weighted in favor of PM-10. Mr. Giles replied that PM-10 is weighted with 1, is higher than the other pollutants. Mr. Gibbs asked if the motion is being ranked by PM-10 and not being by cost effectiveness. Mr. Giles replied correct. Mr. DeLaCruz inquired about the funding available in 2013. Mr. Giles stated that it was \$7.5 million for air quality in 2013. Mr. DeLaCruz inquired if that was the total for everything. Mr. Giles responded yes. Mr. DeLaCruz asked if the street sweeper project will still be funded although the weight reduction based on PM-10 is less than other projects. Ms. Tax stated that the first six projects add up to \$4.5 million. Mr. Kross called for a vote on the motion. The motion passed with one member voting no.

Mr. O'Donnell stated that funding for paving dirt roads is a major concern. He made a motion to recommend that MAG consider reallocating funds for paving dirt roads. Ms. Arnst seconded. Mr. Kross stated that the Committee plans to have MAG transportation staff come to a future meeting with information on procedural changes. Mr. O'Donnell stated that he still wishes to make the motion. Mr. Kross commented that the dialogue amongst the group will be reflected appropriately in the minutes and as it goes forward to the modal committees, TRC, and Management Committee. Mr. O'Donnell

stated that he still would like to continue with the motion. Ms. Arnst stated that she seconded. The motion passes with two member voting no and three abstentions.

5. Evaluation of Proposed PM-10 Paving Unpaved Road Projects for FY 2010 CMAQ Funding

Mr. Giles presented the evaluation of the Proposed PM-10 Paving Unpaved Road Projects for Fiscal Year 2010 CMAQ funding. He stated that six projects requesting \$7.1 million dollars were received. He added that a minimum cash match of 30 percent is required. He mentioned that the deadline for submission of the projects was September 7<sup>th</sup>. He commented that the MAG TIP identified \$3.5 million available for funding of the paving dirt road projects. Mr. Giles stated that additional opportunities to comment beyond the meeting includes the Transportation Review Committee. He stated that as the projects are included in the MAG Federal Program, it is anticipated that they will also be sent to the MAG Management Committee and the MAG Regional Council at the meetings being held in January. Mr. Giles stated that the Committee is requested to recommend a ranked list of the Proposed PM-10 Paving Unpaved Road Projects and to be forwarded to the MAG Transportation Review Committee.

Mr. Kross stated that the issue is to rank the Proposed PM-10 Paving Unpaved Road Projects for FY 2010 CMAQ funding and forward that to the MAG TRC. Mr. Kamps inquired if the table was the 200 miles that the cities have identified. Ms. Arthur replied that the projects are beyond the scope of the PM-10 Plan. She added that for the 2010 money, a year and 18 months is needed to build a road, this would be in addition to those planned in the PM-10 Plan. Mr. Kamps asked if the 200 miles are being claimed in the PM-10 Plan. Ms. Arthur responded that it will be shown in the presentation. Mr. Kamps inquired if the projects in attachment one were different than the 200 miles that have been identified by the local commitments. Ms. Arthur responded yes. Mr. Bouchie stated that most of the projects in attachment one are alleys. He inquired if the projects would be included in the 200 miles which are roads. Ms. Arthur replied that there are roads and alleys in the 200 miles. She added that both are in the plan. She indicated that the alleys have a much lower ADT, most of the alleys have nine vehicles per day, making the credit less because of the traffic. Jeanette Fish, Maricopa County Farm Bureau, stated that there is only \$3.5 million available and \$10.7 million requested.

Mr. Kamps inquired why most of the projects were alleys and why not focus on roads. Mr. Kross stated that this would be a question for the applicants. Mr. Kamps inquired about the shoulder projects. Mr. Giles responded that shoulder projects were not requested in the lump sum of funding provided. He added that the intent was to get paving unpaved road projects. Mr. Kamps asked why shoulder projects were not requested. He added that the consultant specified that shoulders were an issue. Mr. Giles replied that the intention was to try to get the most benefit for the funding being provided. He mentioned that the most benefit comes from paving unpaved surfaces verses shoulder areas. Mr. Kamps stated that he disagreed with Mr. Giles statement. He mentioned that unpaved shoulders and roads are traveled more often than alleys. He indicated that the conclusion he would draw from the cost benefit analyses and the consultants work, is that roads and unpaved shoulders are a much bigger priority and a more valuable way to spend the money. Ms. Arthur replied that most of the cities have already paved all of the public unpaved roads and are now looking into paving alleys. Mr. Kamps asked why not pave unpaved shoulders.

Mr. Berry inquired if there was analysis generated that the Committee could look at to see if the alleys would be more effective than shoulders. He stated that unpaved shoulders were a huge problem based on previous presentations. He commented on the disturbance of shoulders. He added that there is not one paved or stabilized shoulder where the Swift Company is located. Ms. Arthur responded that there

are a lot of commitments in the Five Percent Plan between now and 2010 to pave or stabilize unpaved shoulders. She stated that in this case the cities are paying to stabilize shoulders with the exception of measure 52, the additional \$5 million that was put aside by Regional Council to pave some roads and shoulders. She added that there are some projects that are being paid for by federal funds both in the TIP and the Five Percent Plan. Mr. Berry stated that some of these projects are for \$2-3 million dollars. He added that in attachment five there are alleys that are more cost effective than others. Mr. Berry inquired how the \$3.5 million is being split between two of the projects that are identified in the attachment. He asked if money can be directed to the alleys that would have the most benefit. Ms. Arthur responded that cities can target higher ADT alleys. She added if money was available a recommendation can be made to target the money to the higher ADT facilities.

Jamie McCullough, City of El Mirage, commented that the City of El Mirage asked for the alleys to be paved in the downtown area. She added that the City has utility meters in the alleys and the utility people are going up and down the alley reading meters. She mentioned that the City of El Mirage has more traffic in alleys than other cities. Mr. Gibbs commented that many cities with dirt alleys are the only places of service that experience a trackout problem after there has been rain.

Mr. Kamps stated that the priorities have to be wrote about alleys. He added that the Committee should motion to prioritize with proximity of the monitors. Mr. Kross inquired if that was a motion. Mr. Kamps replied that it was a question. Ms. Bauer stated that the data provided to the Committee is information to be considered by the Committee. She added that measures are to be implemented regionwide including around the monitors. EPA has indicated that you cannot just target the monitors. She stated that emission reductions are needed regionwide and at the monitors. Mr. Kamps commented that he understood. Ms. Bauer stated that the Committee does not want the monitors to go over the standard either. Mr. Berry indicated that the Committee fund the Phoenix project for \$1.48 million and the El Mirage project for \$2.1 million. Mr. Kross asked if that comment was in the form of a motion. Mr. Berry replied that it was a motion. Mr. Kamps seconded, and the motion to prioritize or rank the Phoenix and El Mirage projects for full funding carried with Mr. DeLaCruz voting no.

6. Evaluation of Proposed PM-10 Certified Street Sweeper Projects for FY 2008 CMAQ Funding

Mr. Giles presented the evaluation of the proposed PM-10 Certified Street Sweeper Projects for FY 2008 CMAQ funding. He stated that eighteen projects were received requesting \$3.07 million in CMAQ funds. He added that only \$1.11 million in funding is available for street sweeper projects. He indicated that a minimum local cash match of 5.7 percent is required. He mentioned that the projects were submitted by the September 7<sup>th</sup> deadline. Mr. Giles commented that MAG evaluated the proposed street sweeper projects, and a table has been provided in attachment six that show the kilograms per day, daily emission reduction, cost effectiveness, and dollars per annual metric ton of PM-10 reduced. He stated that additional supplemental information has been provided on the table. He mentioned that Mesa, ADOT, and the two Maricopa County projects have indicated that sweeping will be conducted within one half mile of a PM-10 monitor. Additional opportunities for comment beyond the Committee are at the Management Committee, and Regional Council, both have meetings scheduled for October. Mr. Giles stated that the Committee is requested to recommend the proposed PM-10 Certified Street Sweeper Projects for FY 2008 CMAQ funding. He indicated that MAG has retained the prioritize list for any additional FY 2008 CMAQ funds that may become available due to year-end closeout, including any redistributed obligation authority, or additional funding received by this region.

Mr. Berry inquired the 5.7 percent match. Mr. Giles replied that the Federal Highway Administration provides MPOs with some flexibility in establishing the local match. He added that for PM-10 Certified Street Sweepers 5.7 percent has been established as the local match. Mr. Berry stated that it sounded rather precise. Mr. Giles stated that for CMAQ the federal participation rate is at 80 percent. He commented that there is a sliding scale applied for certain states with large federal land holdings. He indicated that with the sliding scale for the State of Arizona, and the number of federal lands the maximum federal participation rate becomes 94.3 percent leaving a 5.7 percent for a local match. Mr. Berry commented on the evaluation of the projects to the extent of the cities providing a greater match that there is a multiplier effect with the money spread further. Mr. Giles stated that the cost effectiveness is also changed because more of the contribution is not taken into account. Mr. Berry inquired if the adjustment for the match showed up in the cost effectiveness CMAQ dollar cost per annual metric ton reduced column provided in the table. Mr. Giles replied that the cost effectiveness is based on the federal amount requested.

Mr. Kamps inquired how the daily emission reduction numbers were calculated. Mr. Giles replied that MAG has a detailed application that member agencies fill out. In the applications, detailed information is requested regarding the number of lane miles that will be swept with the proposed sweeper, the frequency that the cities will be sweeping at, the average daily weekday traffic on the roads that will be swept and whether the cities are increasing sweeping frequency or the area that is being swept. He commented that there is a detailed formula for calculating the estimated emissions reduction.

Mr. Bouchie stated that the City of Mesa has PM-10 efficient street sweepers that were purchased with CMAQ funds that are being retired out of the Fleet Department. He mentioned that the City of Mesa has a street sweeper that is not cost effective to keep. He added that a request for replacement of the street sweeper was submitted for that reason. He commented that the system does not allow the replacement of the street sweeper with a new PM-10 efficient sweeper because emission reductions can not be shown. He stated that the City of Mesa is still running the sweeper. Mr. Bouchie stated that if the City of Mesa did not run a sweeper for a while emission increases would show and then the City could show an emissions reduction next year in order to put those projects toward the top of the list. He added that he did not know of any way to put those comments in the detailed application in order to show that reductions are going to be there without increasing them. Ms. Arthur replied that MAG recognizes what Mr. Bouchie stated. She added that in the table there are three PM-10 certified sweepers with asterisks next to them that are being replaced. She stated that MAG is allowing what Mr. Bouchie is asking for. She mentioned that evaluation of the efficiency of the unit is being looked at. She added that a new unit is assumed to be at 95 percent efficient because of the down time and each subsequent year is assumed to decrease 5 percent in efficiency. Ms. Arthur stated that an 8 year old sweeper is at 45 percent efficient, which is still higher than a non-certified sweeper. She added that the benefit would go from 45 percent back to 95 percent by buying a new sweeper. She commented that this methodology does not appear in August 15, 2005 methodologies, this is a new methodology because of the requests to replace older less efficient PM-10 certified sweepers. Ms. Arthur stated that this is how it is going to be handled and it is being handled with the 3 projects that are in the table. She added that the benefit is not the same as replacing a non-certified street sweeper but some benefit is acquired assuming that there is a lot of down time by the time the unit is 8 years old.

Ms. Chenausky inquired if an age on the sweepers was asked in the application. Ms. Arthur replied that it was not. She added that a PM-10 certified unit for the cities was procured in 2001 with the assumption that the oldest unit that was previously bought what was being replaced. She stated that

the percent efficiency was figured out using that method. She commented that a study needs to be done to find out what the numbers really are in terms of down time. She added that in some points the cities will want to get rid of the units because it costs more to maintain the units than it is to operate them. Ms. Arthur stated that this is how it is being approached this year but is expected to have better numbers in the future. Mr. Kross stated that the cities have slightly different replacement programs. Mr. Person commented on the table from attachment one, under the column yes or no, he asked if the agencies allocated additional local resources for staff or equipment to support the project. He added that Maricopa County's two requests and the Arizona State University request have not allocated additional resources even though Maricopa County will be sweeping near the PM-10 monitoring station. He inquired if the understanding from this was that sweepers would be purchased for these agencies and those sweepers will sit there because there is no one to operate them. Ms. Arthur replied that this is what those agencies indicated. She stated that presumably, if those agencies were awarded the sweeper they would find those resources to operate them. She added that MAG did not ask that question to the agencies.

Ms. Fish recommended that the Committee review the column in the table, which questions if the requested sweeper satisfy a commitment by the agency in the SIP. She recommended that the committee approve the Goodyear #1, Chandler, Maricopa County #1 and #2, ADOT, and Mesa sweeper requests. She added that the Committee should look at the table and which would have the most impact rather than the most cost effective. Mr. DeLaCruz inquired why Ms. Fish did not add the City of Surprise in the list. Ms. Fish replied that the City of Surprise project is not near a monitor. Mr. Kross inquired if what Ms. Fish recommended was in the form of a motion. Ms. Fish replied yes. Mr. Kross stated that the motion was based on the column that questions if the requested sweeper satisfies a Commitment by the agency in the SIP and with the recommendation that the committee approve the Goodyear #1, Chandler, Maricopa County #1 and #2, ADOT, and the Mesa sweeper requests. Mr. Yantorno seconded. Mr. O'Donnell inquired why Ms. Fish recommend the Mesa request. He asked if Mesa was required by the SIP. Ms. Fish replied that the Mesa request responded yes to the SIP question and will be sweeping adjacent to the PM-10 monitor. Mr. Kross called for a vote on the motion. The motion failed with 9 members voting yes.

Ms. Prybyl motioned to fund the first 6 project in the table. Mr. Gibbs seconded. Mr. Berry stated that he liked the idea of allocating money were the SIP commitments are, although, the Committee would have to find funding for those projects because they are committed projects. He added that he liked the idea of the Committee putting their efforts next to the monitors where there are violations. He indicated that he was unsure if Mesa has had any violations at the monitors. He mentioned that he is in favor of a cost effectiveness measurement. Mr. Berry commented that there should be some sweeping done around the offensive monitors. He added that those would be the only modifications he would do to the motion if he decided to modify. Mr. Kross called for a vote on the motion to fund the first six projects on the list. The motion passed with 8 members voting no.

#### 7. Status Report on the MAG Five Percent Plan for PM-10 and Draft Modeling

Ms. Arthur gave a Status Report on the MAG Five Percent Plan for PM-10 and Draft Modeling. She mentioned that the Five Percent Plan needs to be submitted to the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) by the end of 2007. She stated that five percent per year reduction in emissions and attainment through modeling need to be shown. Ms. Arthur stated that as of the last exceedance, August 23, 2007, there have been 6 exceedances at the W. 43<sup>rd</sup> Ave monitor, 4 exceedances at the Higley monitor, and 0 exceedances at the Durango monitor. She added that ADEQ has indicated that all of the exceedances in 2007 thus far may be attributed to natural events such as high winds. She commented

that the November and December period is approaching. Most of the violations in the last two years were during the November and December period. Ms. Arthur stated that 2010 was added as an attainment date. She added that 2009 was the attainment date she mentioned previously. She indicated that the reason for adding another year is because of the concern of this winter. She presented the County's 2005 Periodic Emissions Inventory for PM-10. She added that this chart shows the distribution by source of the 84,753 tons per year of PM-10 in the nonattainment area.

Ms. Arthur stated that MAG has applied growth factors to develop the 2007, 2008, 2009, and 2010 projections of PM-10 emissions. She demonstrated a table and emission factors that are being utilized to grow those emissions from 2005. She commented that the projections incorporate some improvements of what was done for 2005 including the latest population and employment projections adopted by the MAG Regional Council in May 2007. She added that there has been some work done in unpaved roads. Ms. Arthur noted that in the 2007 inventory, the unpaved roads piece of the pie is much larger. She stated that an analysis was conducted and determined that the unpaved road estimates were low. She mentioned that windblown dust estimates are higher now than they were in 2005. She added that the construction emissions are based on the average construction acres permitted in 2004-2007. She indicated that there is a correction going on in the economy for 2007. Ms. Arthur stated that MAG wants to take into the account the 2007 permitted acreage to the extent possible. She mentioned that the County provided the number through September 11<sup>th</sup> of this year. The 2007 reduced construction numbers are now reflected in the inventory.

Ms. Arthur demonstrated a pie chart of the current inventory. She stated that the pie chart will change a little. She added that it is 10,000 tons higher than the 2005 estimate and that means that the target reduction is higher. She mentioned that these are controlled emissions. MAG received commitments from some cities and towns to start some measures in 2007. Those measures were credited against the 2007 inventory. Ms. Arthur stated that there is about 1,000 ton reduction that has been credited to create this pie chart. She commented that the 2007 pie chart of approximately 95,000 tons gets multiplied by 5 percent to get the number of tons reduction for each year in order to achieve that 5 percent requirement in the Clean Air Act. She added that the number of tons per year is 4,730. The total reduction required for an attainment date of 2010 is 14,190 tons. Ms. Arthur commented that contingency measures are also needed. She added that the manner this is done is by taking the committed measures and applying them to the inventory. A pie chart for each year is generated with the committed measures applied to it. She mentioned that the reasonable further progress is generated by doing a linear graph of the numbers and dividing by 3. She added that contingency measures are required that are equivalent to 3,533 tons per year and this is above and beyond the 14,000 tons.

Ms. Arthur discussed Senate Bill 1552 (S.B.1552) and the commitments from Maricopa County, ADOT, and the cities and towns. Ms. Arthur stated that in a prior meeting in February there was a presentation done before the commitments were known. She added that in the presentation a table was generated that had 100 miles paved and 100 miles stabilized for roads and alleys in the plan and 25 miles paved and 25 miles stabilized for the shoulders. She demonstrated that the commitments by the cities, towns, and the County is way over what was estimated in the presentation in February. Mr. O'Donnell inquired about 2008 and 2009. Ms. Arthur replied that 2010 is the target. She added that some cities are going to stabilize and then pave. She commented that paving is linear but stabilization is not. Ms. Arthur provided a description of the committed control measures quantified to meet the target. These measures cover a variety of sources, including construction, leafblowers, street sweeping, paving or stabilizing roads and alleys, paving or stabilizing shoulders (348 linear miles), which means each side of the shoulders, and burning restrictions. She presented a slide that showed the measures that were not addressed in S.B.1552. She added that the previous committed control

measures that were demonstrated had some component of the measures in S.B.1552. Ms. Arthur stated that MAG allocated an additional \$5 million in the FY07 TIP for paving dirt roads and shoulders which resulted in 15 miles of roads and 45 miles of shoulders by 2009.

Ms. Arthur stated that inspectors will be hired to increase the number of inspections for Rule 310 and Rule 316. Ms. Arthur commented that credit is also being taken for the repave or overlay paved roads with rubberized asphalt. ADOT made a commitment to pave 5 miles of I-10 and State Route 143. She stated that the reason the last measure of PM-10 reduction due to EPA motor vehicle emissions control programs to reduce NOx was included is because it was in the San Joaquin Plan which is the only other place in the Country that has done a Five Percent Plan. San Joaquin relied on the PM-10 reductions due to EPA motor vehicle emission control programs that reduce NOx. She mentioned that San Joaquin produces more ammonia nitrate due to the farming, and as a result San Joaquin took a lot more credit for this measure. She indicated the EPA suggested that this measure be quantified.

Ms. Arthur stated that in addition there are quantified committed contingency measures. She added that committed control measures are against the 5 percent requirement and additional measures were needed to go against the 3,500 tons per year mentioned in a previous slide. She demonstrated the measures that are being used as credit. She commented that the Agricultural Best Management Practices measure was used in the Serious Area Plan and has also been quantified as a committed contingency measure for this plan. Ms. Arthur stated that the measures are committed and they are legally binding. She added that these measures were necessary to show the contingency part of the plan. She commented that the draft emission reductions are over for 2008, 2009, and 2010, which means the 5, 10, and 15 percent for the 3 years have been achieved. She stated that in all the 3 years the requirements will be met.

Ms. Arthur presented charts that display how the measures line up relative to each other. She demonstrated the chart for Committed Control Measures in the Five Percent Plan for PM-10. She displayed the chart for Reductions in 2010 for Committed Control Measures by Source Category. Ms. Arthur presented the Reductions in 2010 for Committed Contingency Measures in the Five Percent Plan for PM-10. She added that these were spread over different sources. Mr. Kamps commented on the measure to have dust coordinators at construction sites greater than five acres. Ms. Arthur replied that the numbers that MAG generated are close to the ADEQ estimates for this measure in S.B.1552. Mr. Kamps commented on the training. Ms. Arthur replied that training is separate. She stated that MAG is performing PM-10 modeling. She added that a Dispersion Model for the Salt River Area under both stagnant conditions and windy conditions is being used. MAG is receiving assistance from Sierra Research and T&B Systems. Ms. Arthur stated that MAG is performing a Proportional Rollback Model for Higley for January 24, 2006 which was a windy day. She commented on the benefits being quantified for the micro scale areas that are being modeled. She added that the benefits may not be the same because the mix of sources would be different.

Ms. Arthur demonstrated the AERMOD output for the Durango monitor on December 6, 2006. She commented that the PM-10 Source Attribution and Deposition Study was done under a series of days where all the measurements were taken under stagnant conditions. She stated that the MAG consultant took the data that was collected and put it into AERMOD to simulate what is being measured at all the monitors. Ms. Arthur stated that the green dots in the chart represent the measurements at the monitors. She added that the various colors in the chart represent the various source contributions. She presented a Comparison of Source Distribution for Durango. She commented on the source

contributions around each monitor being different. Ms. Arthur demonstrated the AERMOD output for the West 43<sup>rd</sup> monitor. She also demonstrated the Comparison of Source Distribution for the West 43<sup>rd</sup> monitor.

Ms. Arthur stated that MAG is performing an inventory for unpaved dirt roads. She mentioned that cities were given a map for verification and the deadline for returning the maps is Monday, October 1, 2007. She commented that feedback is needed from the cities to get a base inventory of unpaved roads and determine what is public and private. Ms. Arthur stated that MAG is establishing a baseline because MAG is going to begin tracking unpaved roads as a part of the Plan. She added that the inventory will be annually updated. She mentioned a workshop in the fall for implementation and tracking of commitments. Ms. Arthur demonstrated a tentative schedule for the Five Percent Plan for PM-10.

Ms. Fish stated that the Governor's Agricultural Best Management Practices Committee formally passed the changes to the Best Management Practices as noted in the Plan. She added that it will go to the office of the Secretary of State and MAG for inclusion. Mr. Kamps stated that the largest increase in emissions in the categories of the pie chart is for unpaved roads based on the presentation from 2005-2007. He added that the unpaved roads category went from 10 percent to 17 percent. He indicated that the only categories that did not change were paved roads at 16 percent and agricultural.

8. Call for Future Agenda Items

Mr. Person stated that he would like to address at the next meeting if the Committee can change anything in the next two fiscal years that would impact the compliance with the PM-10 problem in the region. He added that he would like to know if the Committee is authorized to initiate a request for a major change to the RTP. Mr. O'Donnell stated that he would like to address ozone.

Mr. Kross announced that the next meeting of the Committee has been tentatively rescheduled for November 8, 2007 at 1:30 p.m. With no further comments, the meeting was adjourned.

**PUBLIC HEARING ON THE MAG 2007 FIVE PERCENT PLAN FOR PM-10 FOR THE  
MARICOPA COUNTY NONATTAINMENT AREA**

December 12, 2007 at 5:30 p.m.  
MAG Offices, Cholla Room  
302 North 1<sup>st</sup> Avenue, Second Floor  
Phoenix, Arizona 85003

The Arizona Department of Environmental Quality (ADEQ) and Maricopa Association of Governments (MAG) will jointly conduct a public hearing on the Draft MAG 2007 Five Percent Plan for PM-10 for the Maricopa County Nonattainment Area on December 12, 2007 at 5:30 p.m. The purpose of this hearing is to receive public comments.

According to the federal Clean Air Act, the Five Percent Plan for PM-10 is required to be submitted to the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). The plan contains a variety of air pollution control measures such as Pave or Stabilize Dirt Roads and Alleys; Dust Managers/Coordinators at Earthmoving Sites; Sweep with PM-10 Certified Street Sweepers; Pave or Stabilize Dirt Shoulders; Pave or Stabilize Unpaved Parking Lots and Restrict Vehicle Use on Vacant Lots. The plan demonstrates that the committed measures will reduce PM-10 emissions by at least five percent per year and demonstrates attainment of the PM-10 standard as expeditiously as practicable which is 2010.

The draft document is available for public review at the MAG Offices, third floor, from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. Monday through Friday. Public comments are welcome at the hearing, or may be submitted in writing by 5:30 p.m. on December 12, 2007 to Lindy Bauer at the address below. After considering the public comments, the MAG Regional Council may take action on the plan on December 19, 2007. The ADEQ may then adopt the plan for submittal to the EPA.

Contact Person: Lindy Bauer, MAG (602) 254-6300  
302 N. 1<sup>st</sup> Avenue, Suite 300  
Phoenix, AZ 85003  
Fax: (602) 254-6490